



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,494	07/01/2003	Jun-Young Lee	50391/DBP/Y35	4433

23363 7590 10/11/2006

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
PO BOX 7068
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068

EXAMINER

MOON, SEOKYUN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/613,494	Applicant(s) LEE, JUN-YOUNG	
	Examiner Seokyun Moon	Art Unit 2629	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED ON 09/29/2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☒ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☒ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 19 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: 2, 10, 12, 16 and 18.

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 4-7, 9, 11, 13-15 and 17.


Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Please see the attached correspondence.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

AMR A. AWAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER


Amendments

The proposed amendments filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because:

Claim 1 has been amended to include new issues that were not previously presented in the claims.

Claim 19 has been added that rewrites claims 1 and 2 into an independent claim without canceling the final-rejected claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on September 29, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to the rejection of **claim 1**, the Applicant has pointed out that equating SW5 and SW3 shown on Kishi's figure 62 with the first and second switches disclosed in the claim results in inconsistencies with the operation of Kishi's circuit since closing SW5 and SW3 simultaneously would result in connecting the panel capacitor to ground. However, the Examiner notes that there is no limitation in the claim describing the operation of the switches. Therefore, the Examiner respectfully submits that the Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 1 are not persuasive.

As to the rejection of **claim 7**, the Applicant has pointed out that Kishi does not teach the claim limitation, "*the first voltage and the second voltage are alternately applied to the first terminal of the panel capacitor*". However, the Examiner notes that as the voltage applied to the X electrode changes from $-\frac{1}{2}$ Vs to $\frac{1}{2}$ Vs in Kishi, there is a time period that the voltage at the X electrode of the panel capacitor becomes 0 as shown on Kishi's fig. 61. Thus, there is a time period that 0 voltage is applied to the panel capacitor. Therefore, the Examiner respectfully

submits that the Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 7 are not persuasive.

As to the rejection of **claim 15**, the Applicant has pointed out that the operation of the device disclosed in the claim, "*alternately applying a first voltage and a second voltage ... to a first terminal of a panel capacitor .. the method comprising: applying the first voltage to the first terminal of the panel capacitor by turning on the first switch and the second switch ... applying the second voltage to the first terminal of the panel capacitor by turning on the third switch and the fourth switch*", is not applicable to Kishi's device when SW4, SW1, SW5, and SW3 are equated with the disclosed first, second, third, and fourth switches, respectively. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The arguments with respect to the claim limitation, "*alternately applying a first voltage and a second voltage*" have already been discussed with respect to the arguments regarding claim 7. Furthermore, as shown on Kishi's fig. 59, the voltage at the node of the panel capacitor goes to $+V_s/2$ (first voltage) when SW1 and SW4 are on while the voltage at the node goes to 0 (second voltage) when SW3 and SW5 are on. Therefore, the Examiner respectfully submits that the Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 15 are not persuasive.

October 6, 2006

S.M.